

Jeffery Whitaker [1] his Book, 1696.

5

A CLEAR  
CONFUTATION  
OF

Mr. Richard Allen,

And his Five Commendators,

From their own Confessions, collected out  
of the Vindication of his *Essay*, and fair-  
ly improv'd against them, to the Over-  
throw of their Conjoined Singing in Ar-  
tificial Tunes in Gospel-Worship.

To which is added,

An Answer to Mr. *William Collins's* De-  
fence from the Charge exhibited against  
him in my Book, Entituled, *The Con-  
troversie of Singing brought to an end, &c.*

**T**Here being so much already said in my  
former Treatises, to the Argumenta-  
tive Part of the Controversie of Sing-  
ing, and having in my last Discourse I published  
brought it to an End, for my own part I see  
but little or nothing else to do, than to clear  
it at the end, and so to finish my present Te-  
stimony



simony for the Truth. And that I may do it the more effectually, I shall first answer some few Exceptions in Mr. *Allen's* Reply to me, which I think are most material to clear the way for a full Confutation of his Error from his own Confessions. And,

1. Mr. *Allen* saith in page 59. ' That there is ' no Evidence in the Text, (*Exod. 15. 21.*) that ' either these Dances or Musical Instruments were ' used by them in the Church of God as such, ' but those Dances of the Women with Musick ' (mentioned *ver. 20.*) seem plainly to be spoken of as a Consequence of their Religious ' Thanksgiving in the Church-Assembly, mentioned in the foregoing part of the Chapter.

*Answer.* I have sufficiently proved in my last, as well as in my other Treatises of singing, that *Deborah* and *Barak* did not sing vocally together; For, 1. Some part of the Song, *Judges 5. 7.* (*viz. until that I Deborah arose, that I arose a Mother in Israel*) was not proper for *Barak* to express. 2. 'Tis said, *ver. 12. Awake, awake Deborah, awake, awake, utter a Song: Arise Barak, and lead thy captivity captive, thou Son of Abinoam;* which Expressions shew, that this Song was uttered by *Deborah*, and part of it to *Barak*, and so all of it was not proper matter for *Barak* to express; and also that this was sung at the same time before *Barak* had led his captivity away; and yet in *ver. 1.* 'tis said, *Then sang Deborah and Barak, &c.* and so in *Exod. 15. 1. Then sang Moses and the Children of Israel;* yet it does not follow, that the Children of *Israel* sang all vocally together, any more than that *Deborah* and *Barak* sang with conjoin'd voices, which we find they did not,



not; neither does it from thence follow, that the Womens singing with Timbrels and Dances, seperate from the Men, *Exod.* 15. 20. was afterwards at a different Season, any more than if we should against the Light of Scripture suppose, that *Barak* join'd in spirit with *Deborah* in the chiefest part of her Song, at a different Season, or after he had led his captivity away. Besides, as there is nothing expressed that lays a foundation for this Objection, so there is reason to believe that the Women sang with Timbrels and Dances at the same time when *Moses* and *Israel* sang, *v.* 1. seeing that as 'tis said *Moses* and *Israel* sang to the Lord, so also *Miriam* began the Song to the Lord, which shews that *Miriam's* and the Womens singing was as much a religious Thanksgiving to the Lord, as the Children of *Israel's* was, *ver.* 1, &c. and at the same season, and not afterwards.

2. To what Mr. *Allen* in page 59. says concerning my Authors, which shew the signification of the Greek Word *Hymneo*, (which is simply to praise or give thanks, and also to lament or complain) I shall here answer,

1. That he plainly owns that the word *Hymneo* is not limited in its signification to Songs of Praise, but he strives to prove that its most proper signification is to sing praise, which I deny, and have produced witness enough against it; and there is no need to contend about it, seeing our last Translators have rendered the Hebrew Word *Tehillah*, and the Greek Word *Hymnos*, in the Old Testament, simply Praise.

2. By his picking out of several of my Authors (which render the word *Hymneo* various ways) some expressions that renders it to sing a Hymn



or Praise, and by his improving those that speak most in this Language, he has laboured to raise a dust, that their Testimony should not be so clearly discerned.

But Observe, he has not, neither can he charge me with any false Citation of them, and so cannot destroy the Evidence I bring them for, nor the fuller and clearer Testimony of the rest of my Authors that are noted in my little Tract, where I have only briefly mentioned them, and not largely cited the Evidence of several of them, whose Testimonies were more fully given before in my prelimited Forms, and in my Reply to Mr. *Keach*, to which I refer the Reader, if he please, for further Satisfaction, in this and many other matters that I could not treat of in so small a Tract on Singing as I lately published, with my Remarks on Mr. *Allen's Essay*. But,

3. Mr. *Allen* says, page 61. "That the Learned Mr. *Ainsworth* does not translate the word (as our Author represents him) simply praise, (as if it signified no more) but he tells us (on *Psal.* 3.) that there be three kinds of Songs mentioned in this Book, of which one (he tells us) is called *Tehillah*, in *Greek Hymnos*, a Hymn or Praise.

*Ans.* 'Tis true, Mr. *Ainsworth* says that there be three kinds of Songs in that Book of *Psalms*, viz. *Psalms*, *Hymns* and *Songs*; but tho' he calls them all Songs, whatever Titles they bare, yet it is because they were all Songs for Temple-worship, and not from the signification of every Title; for some of the *Psalms*, viz. *Psalms* 17, and 86, and 90, and 102. are entituled a Prayer



er of *David*, of *Moses*, &c. which denote the nature of those Psalms or Temple-Songs to be Prayer, and not that they are Songs from their Title of Prayer; and so the word in *Hebrew*, *Tehillah*, Greek, *Hymnos*, signifies the nature of the Psalm or Song to be a Praise, as the word is simply and rightly translated by Mr. *Ainsworth*, who translates it in the Psalms, and renders the word in his Annotations on them in eight several places singly or simply to praise, and I cannot find that he renders it in any one place a Song of Praise, or to sing praise, but singly to praise. And therefore Mr. *Allen* has done ill to joyn with Mr. *Collins* against my former complaint, which is now justly against them both, with the rest of their Companions, for abusing my Author in so plain a case, as renders them very unfair in their dealing with me.

See *Psal.* 40.  
3. *Psal.* 65.  
1. *Psal.* 71. 6.  
*Psal.* 119. 171.  
*Psal.* 148. 14.  
*Annot. Psal.* 1.  
*An. Ps.* 145.  
*An. Psal.* 3.

4. Mr. *Allen* in page 71. says, 'The Divine Psalmists do often not only speak of their own singing the Divine Praises, but also call upon others to joyn with them therein; see *Psal.* 9. 2, 11. and 27. 6. and 145. 7. and 146. 1, 2. &c. which plainly shews that the People were to do more than barely say *Amen*, *Psal.* 34. 4. and 33. 1, 3. &c.

*Answer.* These being all the Scriptures I find he brings to prove, that the People sang vocally together with the *Levites* in the Instituted worship of God under the Law, I shall briefly reply in general, That for *David* to say, *I will sing praises to the Lord*, and to exhort the righteous to sing, and such like Expressions are sometimes



to be taken of *David's* personating of Christ, as in *Psal.* 18. 49. applied to Christ, *Rom.* 15. 9. sometimes of Mysterious Prophecies to be fulfilled at or in the glorious day of Christs Kingdom yet to come, and some to those Gospel-times which had the Spiritual Gift of singing, when the Saints did sing in Spirit together by the single voice of their Minister, according to Gospel-Rule, *1 Cor.* 14. 15, 16, 26, &c. And those Scriptures that relate to *David* personally, and the righteous in his day, must be understood as its said of *David*, *2 Chron.* 7. 6. that *David* praised the Lord by the Ministry, or Hand of the *Levites*, and that the People of *Israel* did not vocally sing with their *Levites* and Singers, is also confirmed by the Office or Order of Singers, that singing in the publick worship of God was confined to under the Law, *1 Chron.* 16, to 25. and by the Peoples saying no more after the *Levites* had done singing than *Amen, praise ye Lord*, *Psal.* 106. 48. *Deut.* 27. 14, 15. so that Mr. *Allen* is not able to bring one Text of Scripture in the whole Bible to prove that ever the Congregation of *Israel* vocally sang together with their singing *Levites*; and altho' those Ministers under the Old Testament might sing more than their own experience, yet this is no warrant for others to do the like under the Gospel: Because, the Legal Worship and Service was a formal, carnal, shadowy and propheticall Ministration, 'till the time of Gospel-reformation, and the Heavenly Things themselves were come, *Mat.* 11. 13. *Heb.* 9. 1, 9, 10, 23. Chap. 7. 12.

5. Mr. *Allen* in page 76, 77. to justify his Argument



gument for Art in Singing, viz. That much art was used by the Holy Pen-men of the Scripture in writing them, he asks me, whether holy Men of God could write the Scriptures without the Art of Writing?

*Answer* 1. They were required by the Holy Ghost to write the Scriptures, but Mr. Allen is no way required by the Lord to make use of writing, or any other Art, to practice his way of Singing. Besides, tho' the Holy Pen-men of Scripture might use the art of writing to record them for us, yet the matter of Scripture so delivered, was formed by the inspiration and movings of the Holy Ghost, and not meerly by humane art, as Mr. Allen's Songs are, 2 Pet. 1. 21.

6. Before I proceed farther, I shall take some Notice of what Mr. Allen says, pag. 33. concerning those three Hebrew Words, viz. *Hallelu eth jebboah*, in the Hebrew Bible, Psalm 148. 1. which Mr. Allen in his Essay left out in citing that verse, to make it look like Hebrew Rhime and Metre; saith he, 'I did not omit them on purpose to make it Rhime, is plain, in that instead of four lines in rhime, as I have there let it down, there are six if those words are put in. To which I briefly answer, That 'tis easie to demonstrate this to be a cheat from Mr. Allen's own words, for seeing he makes the three Hebrew words left out before now into one line or verse by themselves, for the second line of his six, and cuts off the word *Hallelujah* from the first line that was of his four lines before, to make it by it self the first line of his six lines now, then either his five lines that he made but



four times before, or the four lines must be a wrong to the Rhime and Metre as he cites them for in the sacred Text: For if it be, as he says, Rhime and Metre in the Hebrew Bible, it must be so as we find it there without alteration, and therefore for him to make four lines of verses in Rhime in one book, and five lines of verses in Rhime in another Book of the same matter, is such an alteration, that renders it a plain Cheat either in his four lines or in his five lines of verses. And by this one instance the unlearned Reader may easily guess at the rest of his Hebrew Rhyming, especially considering he does not tie it to any equal order of Metre. And the true reason of it must be, because the Psalms of *David* ( nor the Songs of *Moses*, and *Deborah*, and *Barak* ) are not in Rhime in the Hebrew Bible, as I have shewed in my last Treatise, from the Testimony of several *Jews* learned in the Hebrew Tongue.

*Secondly*, Having hitherto been removing those Exceptions that were necessary to take some notice of, I shall now proceed to the confutation of Mr. *Allen's* practise of singing, from his own Confessions; and in order thereunto I shall here premise, That

Those five Commendators of Mr. *Allen's* Vindication of his Essay, viz. *Joseph Maisters*, *William Collins*, *Joseph Stennet*, *John Piggot* and *Thomas Harrison*, do in their Epistle say, ' Tho' the Author of the Animadversions on Mr. *Allen's* Essay, — has thought meet to let fly — at us who subscribed a Preface to that Treatise, for no other crime than that of commending the Subject of it to the Reader, and of giving



‘ing our Opinion of the ability of its Author to speak for himself on that Argument, without needing our Recommendation, we are neither afraid nor ashamed to let the World know, that we have yet seen no Reason to retract our words, and we dare venture to say as much of this Reply. To which I answer,

1. That these Words, *viz.* For no other crime than that — of giving our Opinion of the ability of its Author to speak for himself: Altho’ they are brought in as the cause of Dr. Russel’s letting fly at them, yet I do not find that he has in that manner exprest himself in any part of his Book : And therefore I conclude, that those words are the five Commendators own Expressions, as ’tis further confirmed by that which follows, *viz.* We are neither afraid nor ashamed to let the world know, that we have yet seen no reason to retract our words : For these Expressions relating to the Fore-going words implies an Assertion of them to be their own, *viz.* That [they] gave their Opinion of the ability of its Author (*i. e.* of the Essay) to speak for himself : So that it follows,

2. That in these words of the aforesaid five Commendators, there is a false Insinuation, for they not only implicitly say that they commended the Subject of that Essay, but that they gave their Opinion of the ability of its Author to speak for himself on that Argument, without needing their Recommendation, which how true this is, the Reader may judge from their own Words in their former Preface to Mr. Allen’s Essay, where they say, ‘How well he has acquitted



'ted himself in the management of this Argu-  
 'ment, is by himself submitted to the judg-  
 'ment of the world in his publication of it.  
 'We shall only say, that as 'tis not our Business  
 'to use many Words, to prepossess the Reader  
 'in his Favour, so 'tis our Opinion, that the  
 'Book is able to speak for it self, and need  
 'not our Suffrage to recommend it. So that  
 those five Ministers have begun their Testimo-  
 nial Recommendation to Mr. *Allen's* Vindicat-  
 on with a false Insinuation, that in their last  
 Preface they gave their Opinion of the Ability  
 of the Author to speak for himself, without need-  
 ing their Recommendation; when in truth they  
 said it of the Book it self, distinguished by them  
 from the Author. Now I cannot conceive why  
 they should utter this false Insinuation, unless  
 it be to squeez themselves from under their ab-  
 solute commendations of those Errors in Mr.  
*Allen's* Essay, which are justly charged upon  
 them. But surely no sober judicious Christi-  
 ans will either take this false Insinuation for  
 the least acknowledgment, or publick satisfacti-  
 on for the wrong they have done our Profes-  
 sion, or the Truth, or will from this latter Pre-  
 face discharge them from those Errors which  
 they have without exceptions recommended in  
 their former Preface to Mr. *Allen's* Essay: Es-  
 pecially considering, that in their last to his Vin-  
 dication, 'They stoutly tell us, that they are  
 'neither afraid nor ashamed to let the World  
 'know, that they have seen no reason to retract  
 'their former Words, and also that they dare  
 'adventure to say as much for this his Reply. So  
 that I conclude from their former Preface, con-  
 firmed



firm'd in their last, wherein they likewise recommend Mr. *Allen's* Vindication of his Essay, that both his Books without the least Exceptions are recommended by those five Ministers.

*Thirdly*, The next thing therefore to be considered is, what those five Ministers have recommended. As to the former part of their Vindication, I leave the particulars thereof ( if any think them worth their Notice ) to such as are or may be more properly concerned with it : And as to the latter part of it, which had also the approbation of the aforesaid five Ministers, this relating to me I have said something in answer to it before, and therefore I shall now proceed to confute Mr. *Allen's* practice of sing'g from their own Confessions, collected from both the Parts of his Vindication : As in page 59. he says, on *Mat.* 26. 30. and *Mark* 14. 26. " That tho' this  
" be true, that this word *Hymneo* be not limited  
" only to Songs of Praise, it will not prove  
" (saith he ) what this Author affirms, that it is  
" properly used, or signifies simply to praise.  
" And in page 69. Mr. *Allen* says thus, I bring not  
" these Testimonies ( viz. *James* 5. 13. *Eph.* 5. 19.  
" *Col.* 3. 16. ) to prove conjoynt Singing of the  
" whole Congregation together, but only to prove  
" that sing'g of Psalms is the Duty of every Chri-  
" stian : The lawfulness of conjoynt sing'g. I  
" argue from other Scripture Grounds in my  
" Essay. And in page 12, 13. Mr. *Allen* says,  
" as to sing'g with the conjoin'd voices of many  
" together, I only plead for the lawfulness and  
" warrantableness of it, which I prove from se-  
" veral Scripture Arguments. — Not but that  
" I allow, that 'tis also lawful for one voice  
" alone



“ alone to sing the praises of God. Indeed in  
 “ a publick Assembly I conclude 'tis much more  
 “ warrantable for the whole Congregation to  
 “ sing with conjoyn'd voices than for one Person  
 “ there to sing by himself, because we have  
 “ several unexceptionable Instances in Scripture  
 “ for the former, but none ( as I know of ) of  
 “ the latter : And therefore seeing Singing  
 “ either singly or conjointly are but different  
 “ Circumstances of performing the same thing,  
 “ I appeal ( saith he ) to every impartial Reader,  
 “ whether I ought not ( as I did ) to consider,  
 “ whether singing the praises of God be at all  
 “ a Christian Duty, before I discourse of these  
 “ or any other Circumstances of it. And much  
 “ more is it unreasonable, that he should oblige  
 “ me to prove, that 'tis no less than a Christian  
 “ Duty to sing in Metre or Rhime, and with  
 “ artificial Tunes, which are but accidental  
 “ modes of singing, and not essential to it. And so  
 “ far am I ( saith he ) from asserting it to be a  
 “ Christian Duty, in this particular mode of it,  
 “ that I expressly declare it wholly indifferent, to  
 “ sing the Divine Praises either in Prose, or Metre  
 “ or Rhime, according as we judge most for  
 “ Edification. Indeed I give my opinion for the  
 “ preference of the latter before the former, as  
 “ more easie to be performed in a harmonious and  
 “ regular manner, and therefore more generally  
 “ practised by the protestants than singing in prose.  
 “ And in like manner ( says Mr. *Allen* ) I dis-  
 “ course concerning singing by artificial Tunes,  
 “ not asserting or believing them essential to the  
 “ Performance of this Duty, but only requisite for  
 “ the more regular performance of it.

“ And



“ And in *page* 82. Mr. *Allen* further says,  
 “ That whatsoever becomes of these accidental  
 “ Modes of Metre, Rhime, and Artificial Tunes,  
 “ ’tis singing the Divine Praises it self, in a proper  
 “ fence, *viz.* vocally, that I assert to be a Chri-  
 “ stian Duty, which Duty may be performed  
 “ (tho’ I think, with the generallity of Prote-  
 “ stants, not so well) without these modes, as  
 “ well as a Person may be rightly baptized after  
 “ another manner than with his Face upward.  
 “ And in *page* 81. Mr. *Allen* says, The diffe-  
 “ rence I have shewn to be between the parts  
 “ of Divine Worship, and the accidental modes  
 “ and ways of its performance. And he also  
 “ tells us, that the Holy Scriptures is to be our  
 “ only Rule in Divine Worship, and that there-  
 “ fore, 1. For all the essential parts of Divine  
 “ Worship we must have an expresse Prescrip-  
 “ tion in the word. And, 2. All the accidental  
 “ Modes and Circumstances of Divine Worship  
 “ must be ordered suitable to the general Rules  
 “ thereof, *viz.* so as may be most for Order  
 “ and Edification, as he saith in the foregoing  
 “ part of the same page, that Christian Churches  
 “ have liberty to order such accidental modes  
 “ and circumstances of Divine Worship as  
 “ are not particularly prescribed in the Word,  
 “ as they shall judge most for Edification. And  
 “ in *page* 47. speaking of external modes and  
 “ circumstances of Worship, which (saith he)  
 “ I take to be in the power of the major part  
 “ of a Church, so far as to warrant their own  
 “ practice therein.

Fourthly, Having made the preceeding Colle-  
 ction of Mr. *Allen*’s words, recommended and  
 approved



approved by the foresaid five Ministers, I shall make Observations on them as follows. And,

1. That seeing Mr. *Allen* on *Matth.* 26. 30. and *Mark* 14. 26. confesseth, that the Greek word *Hymneo*, which in our last Bibles is there Translated to sing an Hymn, is not limited in its signification only to Songs of Praise, then surely considering also that the same Bibles render the same word *Hymneo*, and *Tehillab* in the Old Testament, simply to praise, notwithstanding the stir he makes about it, he cannot from his own Confessions prove from those Texts that Christ and his Disciples sung the Hymn or Praise after Supper, nor that *Paul* and *Silas* sang their praise, for 'tis the same Greek word, *Hymneo*, that is there also used, *Acts* 16. 25.

2. In page 69. Mr. *Allen* says, That he does not prove conjoynt singing from *James* 5. 13. *Ephes.* 5. 19. *Colos.* 3. 16. but only that singing of Psalms is a Duty : So that their own Pens having owned so much of the insufficiency of those Texts of Scripture to prove their way of Singing, I think we may fairly conclude from their own Confessions, that it cannot be a Gospel-Ordinance.

3. Mr. *Allen* plainly distinguisheth and makes a difference between the Essential parts of Divine Worship, and the Accidental Modes and Circumstances thereof.

4. He says, That for all the Essential parts of Divine Worship we must have an expresse Prescription in the Word : But that all the Accidental Modes and Circumstances thereof which he distinguisheth, and makes no Essentials of Divine Worship, these he saith are left to the



the liberty, and he takes to be in the power of the major part of a Church to warrant their own Practice therein.

5. Mr. *Allen* tells us what those accidental modes and circumstances of singing are, that are no essential parts thereof, nor of Divine Worship. And, 1. He says, that the conjoin'd singing in a publick Assembly, or of a whole Congregation, is but a circumstance, and that he only pleads for the lawfulness and warrantableness of it. Observe it well, he only pleads so for it as he says, from several Scriptural Instances, which to reconcile his Discourse fairly together, must imply that he does not plead for singing with conjoyn'd voices as an absolute Duty, from any express prescription in the Word of God, but as a lawful Circumstance from some (pretended) instances, and so he makes his conjoyn'd voices but an accidental Circumstance of singing, and no essential part of Divine Worship. 2. Mr. *Allen* asserts, that singing in Metre and Rhime is no essential part thereof. And, 3. That singing with artificial tunes are but accidental modes of singing, and not essential to it, nor to Divine Worship. 4. Mr. *Allen* says, that singing the Divine Praises it self may be performed without these modes, viz. of Metre, Rhime, and Artificial Tunes, and I may fairly add without their singing with conjoyn'd voices, it being as he says but a circumstance of singing, and so also as I have shewed 'tis no essential of it, nor of Divine Worship: So that Mr. *Allen* and his five Commendators, viz. *Joseph Maisters*, *William Collins*, *Joseph Stennet*, *John Piggot* and *Thomas Harrison*, having expressly owned and confessed



fed publickly in print, that singing with conjoyn'd voices is but a circumstance of singing-worship, which they themselves shew is no essential part thereof, and that singing in Metre and Rhime, and also by Artificial Tunes, are all but accidental modes of Divine Worship, and no essential parts thereof; it is all one as to say, (except their prestinted forms of words and matter) that their whole external mode, manner, way and practice of singing, is no essential part of Divine Worship, and herein I agree with them, and so (except their prestinted form of words) they have joyned issue with me, to bring this Controversie of singing to an end, and to a single point, *viz.* That a Christian Church has liberty to order such accidental modes and circumstances of Divine Worship as are not particularly prescribed in the Word of God, as she shall judge most for Edification.

5. The Controversie of Singing being now reduced from Mr. *Allen's* and his five Commendators Confessions to this single point, and they having shewed and asserted their singing with conjoyn'd voces, in Metre and Rhime, by Artificial Tunes, to be but accidental modes and circumstances of Worship, that differ from the essential parts thereof, so as that for all the essential parts of it we must have an expresse prescription in the Word, and that all the accidental modes and circumstances of it are left to the Liberty of a Church, it consequently implies, that all their aforefaid accidental modes and circumstances, or ways of singing, have no prescription in the Holy Scriptures. And suppose we should grant them (as he asserts them) to



to be no Essentials of his Singing-worship, yet I cannot conceive what his Cause will gain by it; for whatever Name he gives them, and flatter he makes, as if he had some Scripture-ground for his conjoint-singing, more than for his artificial Tunes, Rhime and Metre, yet seeing he makes it but a circumstance, and all of them accidental modes and circumstances, that are left to the Liberty of a Church, and consequently that none of them are prescribed in the Word of God, I cannot see but that they are of the same nature, as all the superstitious modes and circumstances of Worship of the Church of *Rome* are, and so Mr. *Allen* has still no better warrant for his practise of singing than the Papists have for all their Trumpery, which according to his Doctrine before recited, the *major* part of his Church has Liberty and Power to warrant their practice of: So that Mr. *Allen's*, and his five Commendators Popish principle, tends to the ruine of ours, and the Protestants Reformation more in general.

*Fifthly*, I shall demonstrate, That altho' Mr. *Allen* asserts his unscriptural, accidental modes and circumstances of singing, to be no essential parts thereof, and I agree with him, that they are no essentials (nor any parts) of Divine Worship, yet I do not agree with him that they are no essential parts of his singing-worship, because he useth his artificial Tunes and conjoint vocal singing, as such modes and circumstances of it, that without them he cannot perform his singing Church-worship, and therefore they are essentials of it; for that which is essential to any thing, is that which so belongs to the

B

being



being of it, that without it it cannot compleatly be, which I shall explain more particularly. And,

1. That his singing with conjoined voices is an essential part of his standing Church-ordinance is plain, because without this mode of conjoin'd voices his Ordinance ceaseth, and he must either bring into the Church the practice of singing with a single voice, or no proper, vocal, melodious singing at all.

2. Tho' he calls his artificial tunes accidental modes of singing, yet they are essentials of his singing, because he cannot perform his Singing-Worship with conjoin'd voices without such Tunes. Indeed he tells us, That that Singing it self which he asserts to be a Christian Duty, may be performed without such tunes, *pag. 82.* but what kind of singing he there means, which is not his practice by artificial Tunes, he yet conceals from us. As for Tunes immediately inspired by the Holy Ghost, he pretends not to them, and as for natural Tunes they may serve to make a natural noise, enough to fright away natural men, rather than to gain their affections to his Worship.

3. His singing in Rhyme and Metre he calls an indifferent thing, and also accidental modes of Worship; but tho' he terms them so, or does account them indifferent Circumstances, yet he does not use them in his church, as accidental or circumstantial parts of a common civil action, as such, but of his Divine Worship, and therefore whatever he calls them, they are essentials of it, for there are no circumstances of worship but what are essential to the compleat performance of it. It's true, there are Circumstances attending Worship that  
are



are not of Worship, but of actions meerly as such, as one particular fixed hour of the day for Christians to meet together does attend the time and place of their Worship, but one particular prefixed hour is but a circumstance of the action of meeting as such, and so no essential circumstance of Worship, as time and place is, for another hour may serve as well, but without the circumstances of time and place the Worship it self cannot be. And notwithstanding Mr. *Allen* tells us plainly, that artificial Tunes, Metre and Rhime, are not essential to singing, yet I perceive that he himself in effect makes them essential to it: For he says, that 'tis his Opinion, that to sing in Rhime and Metre is more easie to be performed in an harmonious and regular manner than in prose, and that singing in artificial tunes is requisite for the more regular performance of it. Now is not that which is requisite for the more regular performing of that Worship essential to it, seeing it is not so regular without it? Surely, if artificial Tunes, Rhime and Metre, are either his Rule, or make his Rule of Singing, whatever it be more perfect for that Worship, they must needs belong unto it, and be essential to the more compleat performance of it, than without those modes and circumstances.

*Sixthly*, To me it seemeth plain, that Mr. *Allen's* terms of accidental modes and circumstances are only to gild over his Error, that our People may the easier swallow it down, and how much he writes after the Copy of the Church of *England*, in the preface to the Book of Common-Prayer, appears from the follow-



ing Citation out of it : For it's there said, " That  
 " the particular forms of Divine Worship, and  
 " the Rites and Ceremonies appointed to be  
 " used therein, being things in their own na-  
 " ture indifferent and alterable, and so acknow-  
 " ledged, it is but reasonable that upon weighty  
 " and important Considerations, according to  
 " the various exigency of Times, and Occasi-  
 " ons, such Changes and Alterations should be  
 " made therein, as to those that are in place  
 " of Authority, should from time to time seem ei-  
 " ther necessary or expedient. And concerning  
 their Ceremonies that have had their beginning by  
 the Institution of Man, 'tis there further said,  
 " That those that remain are retained for Dis-  
 " cipline and Order, which ( upon just causes )  
 " may be altered and changed, and therefore  
 " are not to be esteemed equal with God's  
 " Law. From whence I Observe,

1. That as tis 'said the particular Forms of  
 the Service of the Church of *England* are things  
 in their own nature indifferent and alterable,  
 so Mr. *Allen* makes his singing in Rhime and  
 Metre, and by artificial Tunes, but indifferent  
 things, that are alterable ; for he says, that sing-  
 ing the Divine Praises may be performed with-  
 out them, as well as a Person may be rightly  
 baptized after another manner than with his face  
 upward, pag. 13, & 82.

2. That as the Ceremonies of the Church of  
*England*, originally instituted by Man, are for  
 Discipline and Order, so Mr. *Allen* says, That  
 all the accidental Modes and Circumstances of  
 Divine Worship must be ordered suitable to  
 the general Rules thereof, viz. ( saith he ) so

as



as may be most for Order and Edification,  
page 81.

3. As the Ceremonies of the Church of *England* are not to be esteemed equal with God's Law, so Mr. *Allen* calls his ways of singing in rhyme and metre, and by artificial tunes [ with conjoin'd voices ] but accidental modes, and [ circumstances ] that he asserts are not equal with the essential parts of Divine Worship prescribed in the Word of God.

4. The same Scripture that is used in the preface to the Book of Common-prayer for their Ceremonies, is used in Mr. *Allen's* Essay, page 88. for his mode of singing in artificial tunes, 1 Cor. 14. 40. *Let all things be done decently and in order ;* which to understand otherwise than of the Order and Decency prescribed in the Word, and before laid down in the Rule of Worship, in the same Chapter, is a Subversion of the Word of God.

5. I may also add, That as the Church of *England* did formerly press their Forms and Ceremonies of Worship, under the Notion of indifferent things, upon the Consciences of the Dissenters, who by no means could be made to swallow them down, tho' gilded over with their Terms; so tho' Mr. *Allen* has declared against imposing of his accidental modes and circumstances of Worship, yet he and his Companions have so far followed the former steps of the Church of *England*, as to press their modes and circumstances, which they own are no essential parts of Gospel-worship, so hard upon our Churches, as to occasion many Troubles and Distractions among us. So that Mr. *Allen* and his five Companions agree so well with the Preface to the Book of Common-



prayer about the nature of humane modes and circumstances of Worship, that we have reason to believe they have learnt their Notions from the Church of *England*, whereby they are infecting our Churches with such Principles as will naturally lead them to conform at least to their worship.

*Seventhly*, I shall take some Notice of what Mr. *Allen* refers us to in *page* 81. Where he tells us, that he has shewn the Difference between the parts of Divine Worship, and the accidental modes and ways of its performance, in his foregoing — *page* 15. And in *page* 47. speaking of those accidental modes and circumstances of Divine Worship as are not particularly prescribed in the Word, he says, *That there are many such, every one must needs know, whereof some instances* (saith he) *have been given*, pag. 15. where I find Mr. *Allen* mentioneth the three following particulars.

1. He there saith, “ For a Man to provide for  
“ his Family all I presume (saith he) will grant  
“ to be a Christian, yea, a Moral Duty, but ’tis  
“ at the Liberty of every man’s choice in what  
“ just way he doth it, whether by the use of this  
“ or the other Art or Trade.

*Answer.* What is this to our case of Divine Worship? because every man has liberty to choose and use what lawful Art or Trade he pleaseth, for the maintenance of his Family, therefore must Christians have so great a Liberty to choose and practise what accidental modes and circumstances of Worship they please? If this be granted, then if our Churches please they may practice not only common Singing, but the Common Service of the *Church of England*, Common-Prayer,  
Com-



Common Baptism, or Sprinkling of Infants, Common Gossips to Answer for them, Kneeling at the Altar, and at Confession and Absolution, Bowing to the East and Name of *Jesus*, and may set up Organs for their Publik Worship, and a heap of other Ceremonies that were never appointed by Jesus Christ, but accidentally happened from the Errors and Inventions of Men, who do thereby virtually deny that Christ has left his Gospel-Church compleat Directions in the Holy Scripture for the Worship of God.

2. He there saith, in *pag. 15*. "'Tis the Duty  
 " of Ministers to Preach the Gospel, for the  
 " Conversion of Sinners, and the Edification of  
 " Believers; but none (saith he) I suppose  
 " will affirm it is so, to preach it in this or the  
 " other particular way or method.

*Ans.* Having publish'd my mind concerning Preaching, in my *Reply to Mr. Benjamin Keach's Breach Repair'd*, *pag. 75, 76. & 119, to 123.* and it being too large to recite here, I shall refer my Reader thither for further Satisfaction, if it be desired, and only here say, That though I greatly disapprove of Pre-stinted Forms of Words in Preaching, yet there is some difference in Scripture between the case of Preaching and modes of Praises or Prayer. However, it is not at the liberty of preachers to unite their Voices together in that Service; and if any argue for a Pre-stinted Form of Preaching, it is no Example for a liberty of modes, or for a Pre-stinted Form of Singing: If it be, Why not for a Pre-stinted Form of Prayer also, which they may equally bring it for? And till they answer me this Argument, there is no need of any other. *2 Tim.*



1. 13. & 2. 15. and 4. 5. 1 Cor. 2. 13. and 4. 6.  
1 Tim. 4. 13, 15.

3. Mr. *Allen*, in the same page, says of Water-Baptism, " That the Dipping of Believers, is  
" Essential to it, but there are (saith he) dif-  
" ferent accidental modes wherein it may be  
" administred, which are at the liberty of the  
" Administrator to choose.

*Ans.* There are no modes nor circumstances of that Ordinance but what are Essential to the right and compleat performance of it, for such modes and circumstances that are left to the liberty of the Administrator, *viz.* whether to Dip the Person with his Face upward or downward, are no modes nor circumstances of or belonging to the Ordinance it self, because the compleat performance of it is not tyed to the use of either of them ; and therefore, though the Administrator has liberty to make them modes and circumstances of the Action of Dipping, yet not as of or Essentially belonging to that Ordinance, because neither of them are prescribed in the Word, and that Ordinance may be performed without any one, or either of those modes and circumstances.

Thus I have discovered the Weakness of Mr. *Allen's* Arguments, or Instances to justify his accidental modes and circumstances of Singing, to be left to the liberty of a Church ; which Notion, in my Opinion, his own Pen does also confound and clearly overthrow ; for in *pag.* 58. he asserts, " That though the Light of Nature  
" be sufficient (if duly attended to ) to teach  
" us, that we ought to use all our Faculties for  
" the Glory of our Creator and Benefactor ;  
" yet



“ yet I count it not so perfect a Guide as suf-  
 “ ficiently to instruct us what peculiar faculties  
 “ we should exert in stated Church-worship, or  
 “ how we should use them therein, without the  
 “ more perfect Guidance of the Word. Now  
 if this be true, as I firmly believe it is, then  
 surely to leave to the Liberty of a Church,  
 according as Mr. *Allen* says, to warrant the  
 practice of his unscriptural and accidental  
 modes and circumstances, and consequently  
 his practice of singing, which from his Confes-  
 sions is shewed to be no essential part of Di-  
 vine Worship, is to leave a meer humane In-  
 vention to the Liberty of the insufficient Guide  
 of the Light within, to be warranted and used  
 for Gospel-Worship. But as our Saviour saith,  
*That In vain they do worship me, teaching for Do-*  
*ctrines the Commandments of Men,* Mat. 15. 9. So  
 the Reformation from Popery brake forth, and  
 was maintained by the Light and Authority  
 of the Holy Scriptures, which the Faithful Saints  
 and Martyrs of Christ embraced, in opposition  
 to all the Ceremonies and Inventions of Men,  
 rejecting all things in the Worship of God and  
 Administrations of Gospel-Ordinances, which  
 they believed were not prescribed in his Word,  
 as hath been particularly shewed in my last  
 Treatise. Besides, we have the Testimony of  
 the Servants of Christ in this last age, who de-  
 clare in their Printed Confessions of Faith, viz. in  
 the Presbyterians, Independants, and Baptists  
 Confessions of Faith, (to which last is Mr. *Wil-*  
*liam Collins's* Name) where in *Article* 21, 22.  
 they say, “ That the acceptable way of wor-  
 “ shipping the true God, is instituted by himself,  
 and



“and so limited by (or to) his own revealed  
 “Will, that he may not be worshipped according  
 “to the Imaginations and Devices of Men, or the  
 “Suggestion of Satan, under any visible Repre-  
 “sentations; ( mark the following words ) or  
 “any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scrip-  
 “tures. Which in *Article 1.* they say, are the  
 “Supream Judge, by which all Controversies  
 “of Religion are to be determined. So that  
 Mr. *Allen's* Principle of the Liberty and Power  
 of a Gospel-Church, to order and warrant their  
 own practice of unprescribed modes of Divine  
 Worship as she pleases, does strike at a Foun-  
 dation-principle of ours, and the Protestants Re-  
 formation more in general.

*Eighthly*, I desire it may be duely considered, how  
 our singing Brethren are driven from refuge to  
 refuge, and at last have had their Practice of sing-  
 ing clearly confuted from their own Confessi-  
 ons: For those Elders and Ministers whose  
 Names are set to the *Reply* to Mr. *Robert Steed's*  
 Epistle, among whom are set the Names of some  
 of our aforesaid Ministers, *viz. Joseph Maisters,*  
*William Collins,* and also *R. Allen,* in page 8. they  
 say, “ That such was the Singing of God's  
 “ People under the Law, ( *viz.* with voices  
 “ lift up together ) and the Churches are en-  
 “ joynd to sing Psalms in the New Testament,  
 “ and no other way prescribed or laid down  
 “ how they should sing. *Ergo,* ( say they ) the  
 “ Churches are now to sing in the times of the  
 “ Gospel, as God's People under the Law. And  
 “ they farther say, in page 24. That tho' Mu-  
 “ sick and Singing-men ceased when Christ came,  
 “ yet singing did not cease, — because ( say they )

“ it



"it is part of Moral and Natural Religion,  
 "and therefore a standing Ordinance. From  
 whence we may Observe, That notwithstanding  
 the stir they have made about the Singing we  
 find in the New Testament, and of Christ and  
 his Disciples, and of *Paul* and *Silas* singing  
 together, yet we may plainly see from their  
 own Words, that they do not relye upon  
 Gospel-Evidence as sufficient, to justify their  
 way of singing; and finding no countenance for  
 their Practice, from any Example or Institution  
 under the Law, they flee for help to their natu-  
 ral Light within, to make their Singing a stand-  
 ing Ordinance. And tho' Mr. *Allen* and his five  
 Commendators, in their *Essay* and *Vindication* of  
 it, make a flutter, as if they had found something  
 in the Psalms of *David* for their singing with con-  
 join'd Voices, ( which I have shewed proves no-  
 thing of it ) yet they still stick to the insufficient  
 Guide of the Light within, the major part of a  
 Church, as their warrant for the practice of it. So  
 that if we consider their way of singing with con-  
 joyn'd voices, artificial tunes, and rhyme, and metre,  
 which they own are not prescribed in the New  
 Testament, and as Mr. *Allen* shews are no essen-  
 tial parts of singing, and so no parts at all of  
 Divine Worship, it cannot from their own Con-  
 fessions be a Gospel-Ordinance, because they own  
 'tis neither contained in the New Testament, nor  
 is any part of Gospel-worship. And therefore  
 I hope Mr. *Allen* and his five Companions ( with  
 the rest of our Singing Brethren ) will neither  
 plead for it, nor practice it any longer, seeing  
 they have no better Warrant for that Worship  
 than the insufficient Guide of the Light within,  
 the



the major part of a Gospel-Church, which is nothing more than what may be said for a thousand Humane Inventions more.

Therefore seeing their own Pens has thus overthrown the whole of their way of singing (except their prestinted Form of Words, and this also until they have found some other tune to sing them by than what are artificial) and that Mr. *Allen* says in page 82. in distinction to his accidental modes of Singing, that 'tis singing the Divine Praises it self (which he there says may be done without those Modes) in a proper Sense, viz. vocally, that he asserts to be a Christian Duty; if he and his Commendators will stand by these their plain Confessions and Assertions, I hope our Controversie is not only brought to an End, but also will be quickly ended. For we reject as no Essentials of Divine Worship, all that they would have us believe they have so rejected, as before is shewed: And we do assert, Singing the Divine Praises it self in a proper sense to be a Christian Duty, but depending on an extraordinary Gift (or Fullness and Enrichings of the Word and Spirit) as other extraordinary ways of delivering the Word of God in the Apostles time, with strange Tongues and Interpretations, &c. did, and so all the difference between them and us, so far as I can see at present, is, That they assert Singing prestinted forms of Praise, &c. to be a Duty, and at present are so far in the dark how it should be performed, as effectually to tell us, that their manner, ways and practice of Singing, is not prescribed in the Word of God, but that it is at the Liberty, and in the power of a Church to

warrant



warrant their own practice thereof as they please.

But we say, That that Rule of Gospel-Worship in 1 Cor. 14. 15, 16, 26, &c. which they subject unto for other parts of Divine Worship mentioned with the Psalm, as alike pertaining to it, tho' they will not sing by it, with a single voice : This, we say, gives as clear Directions how, and in what mode or manner Singing should be perform'd in a Gospel-Church, as for the delivering other Gifts of the Holy Spirit. Besides, we are not in the dark about it, as they are, but can, and have already, again and again clearly shewed them from the Light of the New Testament, that both the matter and the melody of Gospel-Singing was as the Spirit gave them utterance, and it was a kind of Duty exhorted unto, as the Saints were exhorted to covet after other extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Spirit, and so was not commanded as an absolute continual Ordinance, but as a Circumstantial and Additional Duty to the great Ordinance of Thanksgiving and Praising of God, and of Teaching and Admonishing, which were performed by the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Spirit, which Ordinances themselves still remain to be Ordinances, and are to be performed in an ordinary ministration, without the additional mode of Singing, while we have not such an Additional Gift as the Primitive Christians had, till God may please to adorn his Worship again with it, by a fresh effusion of his Holy Spirit, and then Singing will be a Duty to those that are qualified for it, and for all to seek after, as after the perfection of Gifts and Graces for Private and Publick Worship.

*Ninthly,*



*Ninthly*, To conclude on the aforesaid matters, Seeing our Antagonists are in Effect, Sum and Substance, brought to these Acknowledgments, *viz.* That there is no way prescribed or laid down in the New Testament how they should sing, *i. e.* for their manner of Singing with conjoyn'd Voices, Artificial Tunes, and Rhime, and Metre, and that they have no sufficient Warrant in the Scripture, nor from the Natural Light within, to make those modes of Singing which are practised as Divine Worship, any Essential Parts thereof.

I propose it to the Judgment of all Sober and Judicious Christians, whether their Confessions do not clearly demonstrate they are convinced in their Consciences, that their practice of Singing is a meer Humane Invention? and whether if Mr. *Allen* or any of his five Commendators do either practice it, or open their mouths for it, as a Gospel Ordinance or a Christian Duty, they may not be fairly charged from the Testimony of their own Pens with Will-worship, or to act or speak against the Light of their own Consciences? And if they trouble our Churches further with it, and their Popish Principle of the Liberty and Power of a Gospel Church, on which they ground their Warrant for their way of Singing, whether there will not be reason at least to suspect, that for some outward Interest more than for Conscience sake, they are turning Adversaries against the true Interest of the Baptists Churches, and wilful Betrayers of our Reformation, and are laying the Foundation among us of a grand Apostacy in Divine Worship? And considering that Mr. *Allen* and his five Companions



panions in Defence of their Singing Worship, have given us Ground to fear they design to alter our Churches Settlement, and to new model them ; and seeing the Light and Power of Truth has forced their own Pens to crumble their cause to nothing, or to such a point as may be fairly drawn from their own Confessions and Practice, which they have cause to be ashamed of, *viz.* That those accidental modes and circumstances of singing, and many others that are not particularly prescribed in the Word of God, and (as they say) are no Essential Parts thereof, nor of Divine Worship, are left to the Liberty of the Insufficient Guide of the Light within, the *major* part of a Gospel-Church, to warrant their own Practice of, as Divine Worship, or as Essential Parts thereof, so as she shall judge most for Edification. I hope therefore 'tis a seasonable Request, that they will at last shew themselves to be such good Christians, and real Friends to that Foundation-Principle which they have struck at, as before is shewed, of the Protestants Reformation in general, and to the Baptized Churches in particular, as under a due Sense of the wrong they have done our Profession, and the shame they have brought upon it, to labour to heal their wounds, to confirm the minds of their Brethren whom they have shaken, and to satisfy all that are concerned, with sincere Acknowledgements of their Errors, and Hearty Assurances that hereafter they will joyn with their Brethren against all Innovations in Gospel-worship, and Defilements of Humane Inventions whatsoever : And in so doing, our Churches will have cause to give thanks to God for their Recovery. And their



their Objection against my present being no Member of any Church, ( the occasion whereof is so well known, as that they do not, neither can they justly blame me for it ) I hope will quickly be removed, for excepting some of them ( whose Churches differ in Profession, and are not in Communion with the rest of their Churches as I know of ) 'tis they and other Singers that have so muddied the Communion of their Churches, that I cannot with Satisfaction of Conscience joyn my self to any of them until I see a Reformation.

The foregoing matters being concluded, I shall now proceed to answer Mr. *William Collins's* Defence, at the end of Mr. *Allen's* Vindication of his *Essay* : But before I treat thereof, I shall here premise, That the practice of singing with united voices of Men and Women, Professors and Profane, in the Worship of God, in his Gospel-Church, being first preached up, and vehemently prest upon us by several of our Brethren, and asserted in Print to the view of all men, I thought it necessary for the preservation of the Peace and Purity of the Baptized Churches, to present them with some Arguments against that way of Worship ; which notwithstanding they were offered in a Christian manner, and were consonant to the Principles of our Churches, yet several of our Singers have appeared in print against me, in such a subtil Spirit of Injustice, Deceit and Lying, as hath cost me much Labour, Time and Money, out of my own private Purse to maintain the Truth and Common Cause and Interest of our Churches, from being crush'd by them :



them, an Account whereof has been already given in Print, so far as hath been thought sufficient to answer the Calls of Providence, and to clear my Books from those false Representations of my Principles about Singing, gross Abuses and foul Untruths published in Mr. *Keach's Breach Repaired*, and other Pamphlets, in wrong to me and my Printed Treatises; which Abuses being justly charged upom him and them in Print, many of them under the Hands of several Pastors of Churches, and several particular things by nine other Brethren, they still remain unanswered, on so clear a Record, as that they have not since in more than four years time appear'd in vindication of themselves: And the reason why they have not done it may easily be perceived, for the matter charg'd upon them is in their own Books, and so cannot be stifled from the knowledge of any that will take the Trouble to look into it. But to proceed, my chief Business being to give an Answer to Mr. *William Collins's* Defence, and to clear my self from his Slander, I shall here recite Mr. *Collins's* Words, which are the ground of my Charge against him, and are as follows: Saith he,

“ The Author which Mr. *M.* cites out of  
 “ *Marlorate* on *Mat.* 26. 30. pretends it is uncer-  
 “ tain with what words they praised God; that  
 “ is, whether it was with the common Passover  
 “ Hymn, or some other of Christs own, which  
 “ might be more suitable to the occasion, and  
 “ whether they sang this Praise, or spake it sim-  
 “ ply; the following Words of the Author not  
 “ being well rendred by Mr. *Timme*, I shall set  
 “ down, they are these, *Gracum verbum laudens*  
 C *quidem*



“ *quidem, maxime qua Deo debetur ; includit, non*  
 “ *autem necessario evincit, quod cecinerint ; i. e.*  
 “ *The Greek Word indeed includes praise, chiefly*  
 “ *that which is due to God, but undoubtedly it doth*  
 “ *evince that they sang.* 1. From the genuine  
 “ *signification of the Original Word.* And,  
 “ 2. From the Current of Learned men, who go  
 “ *this way.*

Thus the Latine was falsly Englished, for it  
 should be as it was afterwards altered by them  
 in a few of those Books, *but it doth [not] ne-*  
*cessarily evince that they sang ; which is the same*  
*in sence as my Author Mr. Timme reads it, viz.*  
*but it doth not thereupon follow that they did sing it.*  
 Now as to the Correction that was made ( after  
 this Abuse was taken notice of abroad ) the whole  
 Paragraph was not taken away, as it ought to  
 have been, neither was the former part of it at all  
 altered, which discovers the Design of Mr. Collins  
 to deceive his unlearned Reader with a false Tran-  
 slation of the Latine, as plainly appears from  
 the Paragraph. 1. Because for Mr. Collins to  
 tell us, that Mr. Timme had not well rendred  
*Marlorate's* Latine, when he had rendred his  
 true sence, he must needs do it on purpose to  
 deceive his unlearned Reader with his false  
 translation of it ; for otherwise seeing Mr. Timme  
 had done it in the right sence, there was no need  
 at all for Mr. Collins to write that Paragraph  
 against him. 2. If the word [not] had only  
 been left out in Mr. Collins's English, we might  
 have imputed it to be the Printers fault ; but we  
 also find that Mr. Collins saith, that Mr. Timme  
 pretended it is uncertain, whether they sang that  
 Praise, or spake it simply, and then in contradi-  
 ction



ction to him, he asserts, *That undoubtedly it doth evince that they sang.* 3. 'Tis plain that the word [ not ] was left out, on purpose to deceive the unlearned Reader, because there is no Reason to believe, that Mr. *Collins* did design positively to affirm from *Marlorate's* Latine, That Christ and his Disciples did not sing the Hymn after Supper, by translating the Latine falsely, to give an undoubted Testimony against his own Cause, but to make his unlearned Reader believe that undoubtedly they did sing, when he knew in his Conscience that the Latine leaves it undetermined, saying only, *That it doth not necessarily evince or shew that they sang,* Mat. 26. 30.

Moreover, I well remember, that I told Mr. *Collins*, between him and me alone, of his abusing my Author, and he excused it with laying the fault upon the Printer; but I answered, that tho' Printers sometimes correct Words, yet they never use to add a whole Paragraph to their Authors Books; and therefore I said, it look'd like a design'd Abuse, to which he made me no answer, and so we parted.

And as to the Correction that was made in some few of those Books, to cover the Deceit from me at first, it was not of the former part of the Paragraph, for the alteration began at the last Clause of the Englishing the Latine. And I have yet reason to complain, that it was no sufficient satisfaction for the wrong done me, because some time after it was told me that this Abuse was corrected, I desired my Brother Mr. *Luke Leader* to go to Mr. *Keach* for one of them, and my Brother testifies that Mr. *Keach* took down several of those Books from off the Shelf,



before he could find one that was corrected ; and to my own knowledge since it was pretended they were corrected, some of those Books were in other places exposed to publick sale uncorrected. Besides, I have also seen, and can produce two others of those Books, that are testified to be lately bought at Mr. *Keach's*, or of his Daughters, that sold them in their Shop in the months of *June* and *July* last, 1696. that have this abuse remaining in them uncorrected, in the last leaf of the Book, which might easily have been removed if they would. Having thus recited the matter of Fact, tho' not in the same Order as it was printed before, I shall here take some notice of Mr. *Collins's* Defence that he makes for himself, at the end of Mr. *Attkin's* Vindication of his *Essay*. And,

1. I Observe, that Mr. *Collins* owns that he wrote that sheet of Paper, viz. at the end of Mr. *Keach's* *Breach repaired*.

2. He acknowledgeth there was a false Translation of a Latine Passage in it, but says, that this was done by the Overseer of the Press, who altered the truth of his Translation : And by this he also owns himself to be the Author of that Paragraph, the former part whereof, which proves that he design'd to make that false Translation, he makes no Answer to.

3. He tells us that he strictly enjoined the Author of the Book, (viz. Mr. *Benjamin Keach*) that the leaf wherein it was should be reprinted, and that a Letter was immediately sent to me, to let me know that this false Translation was not in his Copy ; and yet notwithstanding this that I falsely in Print charge him with this Translation



station : And he also says, that this willful Sin he laid to my Charge, before an Assembly of Elders and Messengers at *Devonshire-Square Meeting House* some years ago, where being Self-condemned, ( as he saith ) I had, to the best of his remembrance, nothing to say in my own Defence. This being the Sence and Substance of Mr. *Collins's* Defence, my Answer follows. And,

1. To what he says of a Letter being sent me, I must return him this Answer, *viz.* That I have not the least knowledge of any such Letter that was ever sent me, or came to my Hands, from him or any other Person whatsoever, concerning that matter : But if it had been so, yet his Evidence in this case had been no better than what he has now presented to us in print, and is disproved by the former part of his own Paragraph, which is as clear a Testimony, as if there had been an hundred personal Witnesses against him : And therefore, the main part of his Defence, which is that he corrected the English, and added the word [not] which was left out, does not at all clear him from my charge, grounded on the former part of his Paragraph, *viz.* That he wrote it, and consequently did falsly English that Latine, on purpose to abuse my Author, and deprive his unlearned Reader of that sound Testimony of the true signification of the *Greek Word Hymneo*, in *Mat. 26. 30.* In the next place my business is to clear my self from the latter part of Mr. *Collins's* Defence, where he says, that this willful Sin ( *viz.* of charging him with this false Translation ) he laid to my Charge before an Assembly of Elders and Messen-



gers at *Devonshire-square* Meeting-House, some years ago ; where being self-condemned, as he saith, I had, to the best of his Remembrance, nothing to say in my own Defence. To which I Answer,

1. That that Assembly of Elders and Messengers at *Devonshire-square* Meeting-House, which Mr. *Collins* speaks of, was in the Year 1692. and was the first time that such a general Assembly met in that place, that ever I heard of, or was concerned with, and since that I have not been present at any such Assembly ; and therefore what Mr. *Collins* asserts concerning my self-condemnation, cannot relate to any other time.

2. Through the unrighteous Clamour and Influence of Mr. *William Collins* and Mr. *Benjamin Keach*, with the help of some of their Friends, the Names of my two Books, or Reply and Narrative bound up in one Book, in answer to Mr. *Keach*, were printed in a Paper, to which was put the Names of seven Brethren, who in that Paper determined, *That none of the Members of the Churches do buy, give or disperse any of these Books, (say they) aforesaid under writ.* But as my Name was not at all mentioned in that printed Paper, so there was no particular matter or thing charged in it on me, or any of my Books, in wrong to any Person or Books whatsoever. Besides, in the same printed Paper, those seven Brethren did there own, that they had not seen my Books, which they had there censured, and determined that I should call them in, and leave them to their dispose, insomuch as it does appear that this sower contrivance (of foisting the Names of my Books in at the end of that Paper, which properly



propely concerned other Persons and Books therein named, and not mine, which they own they had not then seen ) was not to relieve Mr. *Keach* and Mr. *Collins* from any wrong done to them by me, or any of my Books, but to stifle my Testimony for the truth that was then coming forth, in my large Reply to Mr. *Keach's Breach repaired*, and that his Abusive Book might have the freer course to advance their singing among the Churches. Therefore I desire it may be well considered, whether there is any reason to believe that I was self-condemned for falsely accusing Mr. *William Collins*, when those seven Brethren in their printed paper laid no particular matter or thing, in wrong to any person, unto my charge: Nor does Mr. *Collins* in his Defence pretend they did. What reason then is there to imagine, that at the same time I should in apparent wrong to my self, condemn my self? especially considering, that as soon as I could (after I had knowledge that my Books were so abused in that paper by those seven Brethren) I drew up and printed some Remarks on it, in vindication of my self, and to clear my Books from that Injustice, which Remarks have never yet been answered. Surely therefore this carries a demonstration that I was not self-condemned, and that Mr *Collins's* Assertion of it is a contrived Lye, a Confirmation whereof you have as follows,

**A**T the Request of Mr. *Isaac Marlow*, who desired me to testifie what I remember of what past in the General Assembly of the Messengers of the Baptized Churches, in the year 1692. concerning him, I do hereby declare, that I do remem-



ber there was then some Discourse that pass'd from him and Mr. *William Collins*, about some matter of Difference between them two: But I do not remember that there was any thing spoken to Mr. *Marlow* aforesaid, by the Elders and Brethren then present, by which it might seem as if they judged him self-condemned: And I do believe they did not see any reason to charge him with the same, neither was there any conclusion made by them against him, tending to any such thing; for had there been such an apprehension and conclusion about him, it would be inserted in the Narrative of their Proceedings, that was published of that Assembly; in which all that peruse it will see there was no such thing charged on him. In Witness whereof I have set my Hand this 29th. of the 8th. Month, 1696.

*William Kiffin.* [ a Pastor ]

**T**Hese are to certifie whom it may concern, that I was at the Assembly of Elders and Messengers held at *Devonshire-square* Meeting House, in the year 1692. and heard the matter indifferently debated between Mr. *William Collins* and Mr. *Isaac Marlow*, and Mr. *Marlow* did stand firmly to what he had written and printed in his Book. And I also declare, that I do not remember that I heard Mr. *Marlow* say any thing in order to Self-condemnation; (had there been such a thing declared by him, I do not question but I should have heard it fully improved against him) nor that the Assembly or any part who acted by the Authority of the whole, did charge Mr. *Marlow* or any of his



his Books, with doing any wrong to any Person  
or Books whatsoever.

Witness my Hand Octob. 10. 1696.

*Hugh Smith.* [ a Minister ]

**W**Her as it is desired that we should give  
some brief account in relation to a par-  
ticular case concerning Mr. *Isaac Marlow's* being  
self-condemned at an Assembly of Elders and Mes-  
sengers at *Devonshire-square* Meeting House, in the  
year 1692. for falsely charging Mr. *William Collins*  
with a false translation of some Latine, we do  
hereby testifie, that we were in that Assembly,  
where we heard Mr. *William Collins* mention some-  
thing concerning Mr. *Timme*, and a false transla-  
tion of a piece of Latine, which he said was the  
Printers fault ; but tho' we were there concerned  
as Messengers and Members of that Assembly, yet  
we know of nothing that passed there from Mr.  
*Isaac Marlow*, that had any tendence to his self-  
condemnation ; but contrary wise the said Mr.  
*Marlow* did strongly persist in his own vindica-  
tion. And we farther testifie, that that As-  
sembly, nor any part thereof, that acted by their  
appointment, did neither charge Mr. *Marlow* nor  
any of his Books, with any particular thing in  
wrong to any Person or Books whatsoever that  
we remember.

Witness our Hands,

*Robert Steed.*

*John Scot.*

[ a Pastor ]

[ a Pastor ]



**I** Being desired, have here drawn up the truth of what I know concerning the case of Self-condemnation, which Mr. *William Collins* asserts that Mr. *Isaac Marlow* was under, and I testifie as followeth, viz. That I was at the Assembly of Elders and Messengers, at *Devonshire-square* Meeting-House, in the year 1692. where on Mr. *William Collins* and Mr. *Benjamin Keach's* Reflections on Mr. *Isaac Marlow*, the said Mr. *Marlow* did earnestly desire that his Books might be examined, and did there freely promise, that if they could shew, that he had done any wrong to any, or committed any mistake, he would make full satisfaction; but no particular abuse or wrong was alledged by the aforesaid Assembly, or any acting by their Order against the said Mr. *Marlow*, who there stood firmly and instantly in his own vindication: And in all the frequent converse I have had with him, both before and since, I never found any thing like self-condemnation in him about those things; and therefore I greatly wonder that Mr. *William Collins* should dare to assert that Mr. *Marlow* was self-condemned, seeing all his words and actions shewed plainly and absolutely the contrary: I cannot therefore but conclude, that that assertion of Mr. *Collins* is an untruth, against the Light of his own Conscience, for which great Evil I desire the Lord would give him true repentance.

Witness my Hand, *Octob. 12. 1696.*

*Luke Leader.*

More.



Moreover, this Mr. *William Collins* ( with an other Person ) is named in the aforesaid printed Paper, as one that was to Answer for the slander rais'd on our first Baptized Churches, in their Reply to Mr. *Robert Steed's* Epistle, where it's said, pag. 9. " We ask you whether or no generally " the same Baptized Churches, in those times, " did not as unanimously conclude, and declare " it too, that for a Gospel Minister to have a " yearly allowance, or a competent maintenance, " was an humane Invention, and Antichristian? " We speak in part upon our own knowledge, " and by good Information we have had from " others, that both those Gospel Duties and Or- " dinances were equally decryed; ( viz. Sing- ing with voices together, and Ministers mainte- nance )

To this Mr. *William Kiffin*, Mr. *Robert Steed*, Mr. *George Barrat*, and Mr. *Edward Man*, ancient Pastors of Churches, in their printed Answer, page 17, 18. say, To this Charge we answer, " That " nothing can be more falsely asserted, or more " slanderously uttered: — What the judgment " of those Churches in their first constitution " was, concerning the maintenance of Ministers, " may be seen in the 38th. Article, ( of their Con- " fession of Faith, printed in the year 1644. ) in " these Words, *We do believe that the due main- tenance of Ministers should be the free and voluntary communication of the Church, that according to Christs Ordinance, they that preach the Gospel should live on the Gospel, &c.* Likewise at the end of my printed Narrative nine other Brethren have cited this Article out of those Churches Confession of Faith, and have given their publick Testimony against



against the aforeſaid Slander, which was not only published with the Authority of Mr. *William Collins's* name, but he by his own agreement obliged himſelf as a Perſon particularly to answer for it, as appears in the aforeſaid printed Paper, wherein thoſe ſeven Brethren condemn'd that ſlander as a great wrong to the firſt baptized Churches : And I ſee no reaſon why Mr. *William Collins* as well as his Fellow Singer, that was equally concerned with him, ſhould not have been required, as he was, to make the ſame acknowledgment of his Error. And if Mr. *Collins* ſhould ſay, that he was not required to make an acknowledgment of his evil in that ſlander, becauſe the fault was the other Perſons alone, and therefore it was laid on him only : I answer, that Mr. *Collins, &c.* in that ſlander ſays, *We ſpeak in part upon our own knowledge, and by good information we have had from others, &c.* which being expreſt in the plural number, includes more than one Perſon ; and Mr. *William Collins* having ſubmitted himſelf as the other, to answer for it, he muſt alſo be taken for one of the two principal Authors of that Slander, which was condemned as aforeſaid. So that had thoſe ſeven Brethren been more impartial, ( ſome of whom I believe are ſincere Chriſtians, tho' ſurprized and drawn aſide to cover the deſigns of ſubtile heads for ſinging ) we might have had leſs occaſion now to have treated on theſe matters.

Which to conclude, ſeeing Mr. *William Collins*, for the ſake of his Singing-worſhip, has made himſelf guilty of ſo foul a ſlander on our firſt baptized Churches, 'tis the leſs wonder that I and ſome of my Authors ſhould meet with ſuch evil



evil Treatment from him ; and to find his name ( with his four Companions ) to recommend Mr. *Allens* aforesad Cheat about the Hebrew Rhime, and to other unfair matters: For which publick Failings, and all other Sins, I desire he may have the Grace of true Repentance given to him, that his sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshment shall come from the presence of the Lord.

Moreover, Forasmuch as Mr. *Allen* and his five Companions have so far followed the Steps of their Fellow-Champions that went before them in this controversie, as to set their Names in print, ( as before is shewed ) to such Deceit and Error, that cannot be justified by any of them, I think our People have no reason to regard their writings of it, nor to credit their publick Testimonies. And I hope those Churches that are particularly concern'd, will in Obedience to Christ, and for Truths sake, discourage that Spirit of Deceit and Lying, that has appear'd in defence of the common way of singing, and is an evident sign of its being false Worship, that so the failings of particular Persons may not become their Churches Sin and Shame unto Posterity: And that they and other Churches will be watchful against the mischief of false Worship, even where it is not practis'd. For while any of our Churches which do not practise the common way of singing, hold Communion at the Lords Table knowingly, with any of their Members that practise it with other People, such Churches defile their Separation in the same nature as if they had Communion with a whole Church that practis'd the same,  
and



and lay a foundation of Ruin to their own Reformation from false worship ; for if it be lawful by the Word of God, for a Church to have such full Communion knowingly with one Person that practiseth false Worship with other Christians, why not with ten Persons, and with a whole Church that practiseth the same Worship ? and if this be lawful, then why may they not so hold Communion with the same false Worship ( or with false Worshippers respecting that particular ) practised in their own Church, as well as with another Church that is in the practice of it. So that the natural consequence if followed, of a Churches allowing full Communion at the Lords Table with one person that practiseth false Worship, leads to the bringing of it into use among themselves, and so to ruin their Separation and Reformation. And if any say, that such a strict Discipline as I am for, will hazard the breaking or dividing of many of our Churches about *London* : My Answer is, That if so, 'tis chiefly to be attributed to our singing Elders and Ministers, that have so far corrupted them, that they cannot bear a thorough Separation and Reformation, and then we may see what sad work they have made among us. The Lord awaken his People unto Righteousness, and supply the want of true Reformers, that I and others who have walked in Church Communion for many years, which at present are unsettled, may to our Comfort in the Bosom of a pure and completely constituted Church of Christ, leave this World when our appointed time is come.

And that none of our Churches may be under the Conduct of such a Treacherous Popish Prin-



Principle of the Liberty and Power of a Gospel-Church, as appears in Mr. *Allen* and his five Companions, which does not only cast contempt upon the Sufferings of the Saints for Reformation in Divine Worship, but openly confronts the Confessions of the Protestant Dissenters in this Nation, and is a shame unto those six Ministers that have broach'd it among the Baptists Churches.

*Isaac Marlow.*

London,  
December 1.  
1696.

---

FINIS.

---